

Remarks

This is in reply to the official action of November 15, 2005. A two-month extension of time for response is requested to April 15, 2006.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 62 under 35 U.S.C. 112 because of improper dependency. This rejection has been rendered moot by amendment.

The Examiner has rejected claims 54, 55, 58, 60, 61, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 81, 82, 83, and 96 as being anticipated by Lehmann (US 2003/0156178).

This rejection should be withdrawn with respect to the claims as amended.

The amended method claims all require “that printing substance is first transferred to a print transfer medium and then from the print transfer medium to the imprinting material, said electromagnetic waves being directed so that they avoid passage through the transfer medium.”

The amended apparatus claims all require “said machine being arranged so that printing substance is first transferred to a print transfer medium and then from the print transfer medium to the imprinting material, said energy-emitting apparatus being arranged such that said electromagnetic waves are directed so that they avoid passage through the transfer medium.”

The cited reference does not disclose or suggest these limitations. The only mention in the cited reference of anything remotely similar is the ancillary statement in paragraph [0092] “In general, however, non-transparent imprinting materials 34 are not to be printed on, so that the printing point placed on the glass cylinder 12 has to be transferred onto the imprinting material 34.” In this case, it is clear that glass is not a preferred or even suitable transfer medium. It is clear that the surface of the cylinder is in fact entirely smooth or a laser beam passing through it would become defocused destroying any reasonable imprint. Such hard smooth surfaces do not retain ink well or maintain ink arrangement. Further, as disclosed in the cited reference, the beam must pass through the glass cylinder which is entirely contrary to and teaches away from electromagnetic waves being directed so that they avoid passage through the transfer medium as required by all claims and as clearly shown in Figure 11 and described in paragraphs [0084]-[0086] of the present specification.

The rejection must be withdrawn for this reason alone. It should also be pointed out that new claims 102-103 require further limitations distinguishing over the cited reference. These claims (emphasis added) read as follows:

“102. (new) The printing process according to claim 1 where the print transfer medium can be **roller guided about a radius.**”

Glass cylinders cannot be “roller guided about a radius” and there is no disclosure or suggestion of such a thing in the cited reference.

“103. (new) The printing process according to claim 1 where the print transfer medium is a **continuous blanket.**”

Glass cylinders are not a continuous blanket and there is no disclosure or suggestion of such a thing in the cited reference.

The same is true with respect to new claims 104 – 108.

The rejections should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 56, 57, and 70-72 under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Lehmann (US 2003/0156178).


All of these claims contain the same limitations as the claims discussed above with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection. As discussed above, Lehmann does not suggest those limitations. These claims are therefore clearly unobvious to one skilled in the art over Lehmann and therefore claims 56, 57 and 70-72 are patentable over Lehmann for the reasons discussed above.

This rejection should clearly be withdrawn.

Attorney Docket No. WSP229US  
U.S. Patent Application No. 10/506,591  
Reply to Office Action of November 15, 2005  
Date: April 7, 2006

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is clear that all rejections should be withdrawn and all claims should be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michael L. Dunn

Registration No.25,330  
CUSTOMER NO. 24041  
Simpson & Simpson, PLLC  
5555 Main Street  
Williamsville, NY 14221-5406  
Telephone No. 716-626-1564

MLD  
Dated: April 7, 2006